

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-19, 21 and 23-24 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim rejections

Claims 1-4, 7 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robarts et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0278741; hereinafter “Robarts”) in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428; hereinafter “Lee”) and further in view of Dagtas et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0093260; hereinafter “Dagtas”).

Claims 8-15, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robarts in view of Lee and Dagtas, and further in view of Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 7,213,256; hereinafter “Kikinis”).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robarts in view of Lee and Dagtas, and further in view of Hori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,209,942; hereinafter “Hori”).

Applicants traverse the rejection as follows.

Claim 1

In the Amendment filed December 28, 2009, Applicants argued that Dagtas does not teach or suggest that “the search frequency corresponds to a frequency at which the search terms are input from the external input device.” In response, the Examiner asserts that:

Lee teaches on (column 5 lines 14-15) the keywords in the list could each be ranked based on frequency or frequency weighted by the context in which the keyword appeared. This

clearly teaches the search frequency corresponds to a frequency of the search terms. In addition, Dagtas teaches the search term can be inputted externally. Dagtas teaches on (page 4 paragraph (0055)) controller (250) and display unit (130) asking the user to input a desired search field weight factor for each search field. This clearly shows the input from an external device taught by Dagtas. (See page 2 of the Office Action).

Applicants disagree with the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

The claimed invention of claim 1 is directed to a content program information search system comprising a server logically connected to a first database configured to store a plurality of search terms inputted from external devices, wherein the server extracts from the first database search terms based on an order of priority based on search frequency and the search frequency corresponds to a frequency at which the search terms are input from the external input device. As such, according to the claimed invention, the search terms are extracted based on a frequency at which the search terms are input. However, Lee and Dagtas do not teach or suggest these feature of claim 1.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Robarts and Lee are silent in teaching a system wherein the search frequency corresponds to a frequency at which the search terms are input from the external input device. However, in the Response to the Arguments section on page 2 of the Office Action, the

Examiner relies on column 5, lines 14-15 of Lee to allegedly disclose that the search frequency corresponds to a frequency of the search terms.

In response, Applicants respectfully submit that in column 5, lines 14-15, Lee merely discloses that the keywords in the list could each be ranked based on the frequency in which the keyword appeared. However, the frequency at which the keyword appeared in a search result does not teach or suggest a frequency at which the search terms are input.

Furthermore, in the Response to the Arguments section on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to only rely on Dagtas to allegedly show that the search term is input from an external device. Specifically, the Examiner cites paragraph [0055] of Dagtas to show the input from an external device.

First, the cited portion of Dagtas discloses that a controller generates a message asking the user to input a desired search field weight factor. However, this does not teach or suggest inputting search terms from an external device.

Second, even if, *assuming arguendo*, Dagtas discloses input from an external device, it does not teach or suggest **a frequency at which the search terms are input** from the external input device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the issue is not if the search terms are input from an external device or determining how frequently the search word appears in a search result. Instead, the claimed feature requires that the search frequency correspond to the **frequency at which the search terms are input** by the external device. That is, the input frequency of the search terms are used to determine the order of priority.

Since both Lee and Dagtas, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the input frequency of the search terms being used to determine the order of priority, i.e., “the search frequency corresponds to a frequency at which the search terms are input from the external input device,” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentable.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

Claims 8, 11, 15 and 19

Applicants submits that since claims 8, 11, 15 and 19 recite subject matter analogous to claim 1 and since Kikinis does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing in Robarts, Lee and Dagtas, claims 8, 11, 15 and 19 are patentable for at least the analogous reasons claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 12-14, 17, 18, 21 and 23-24

Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 7, 9, 12-14, 17, 18, 21 and 23-24 depend from one of the independent claims, and therefore these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 5 and 6

Applicants submit that since claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and since Hori does not cure the deficiency noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No.: 10/733,579

Attorney Docket No.: Q77326

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 3, 2010

Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551